

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

590 W. El Camino Real, Mountain View, CA 94040
Telephone: (650) 961-8300 Facsimile: (650) 961-8301
www.beyerlaw.com

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 05 2005

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

April 5, 2005

Receiver: Examiner Kim

TEL #:

FAX #: (703) 872-9306

Sender: Susan W. Xu for Ramin Mahboubian

Our Ref. No.: CLARP029

Re: Application No. 09/847,123

Pages Including Cover Sheet(s): 05

MESSAGE:

Dear Sir:

Please deliver the attached APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM and the proposed amendment to Claim 1 to Examiner Kim.

Please enter this in the file.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

APR 05 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Thatcher et al.

Attorney Docket No.: CLARP029/P2670

Application No.: 09/847,123

Examiner: KIM, JUNG W

Filed: May 1, 2001

Group: 2132

Title: NETWORK COPY PROTECTION FOR
DATABASE PROGRAMS

Confirmation No.: 5414

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSIONI hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by
facsimile to fax number 703-872-9306 of the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office on April 5, 2005.

Signed: _____

Susan W. Xu

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORMCommissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Tentative Participants:

- 1) R. Mahboubian
-
- 3)

- 2)
-
- 4)

Proposed Date of Interview: Per the Examiner

Proposed Time: PM (Eastern Time)

Type of Interview Requested:

☒ Telephone ☐ Personal ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit to be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes, provide brief description:**ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims/ Fig., #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
1) 103	Claim 1 as amended	Wobber et al. and Robert et al.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) 103	Claims 10-20	Wobber et al. and Robert et al.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) 112	Claim 12	None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CLARP029/P2670

1 of 4

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF AGRUMENTS TO BE PRESENTED:

The combination of *Wobber et al.* and *Robert et al.* does NOT teach or suggest: determining by a second database program whether another copy of a first database program is to be connected to the second database program

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action, page 5, paragraph 9), it is respectfully submitted that reference No. 102-1 shown in Figure 4 of *Wobber et al.* does NOT teach this feature. It is noted that *Wobber et al.* states that a "requester can be a principal using any one of the computers in the distributed system," and "processes many layers removed from human direction, such as those in a transaction processing system, can also be principals" (*Wobber et al.*, Col. 4, 13-20). In addition, as noted by the Examiner in the Office Action (page 3, paragraph 8), *Wobber et al.* states that a request is authenticated using credentials. It is very respectfully submitted that authenticating a request does NOT teach or even remotely suggest determining whether another copy of a database program is connected.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *Wobber et al.* cannot possibly teach or suggest: determining whether another copy of a first database program is connected to a second database program. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *Wobber et al.* does NOT pertain to a database program that accesses a database. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *Wobber et al.* cannot be combined with another reference to teach the invention recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *Robert et al.* does NOT teach determining whether another copy of a first database program is connected to a second database program. It is noted that *Robert et al.* states: "a license management facility maintains a license unit value for each license," and "determines whether the remaining license unit value exceeds the license usage allocation unit value associated with the use" (*Robert et al.* Col. 2, lines 8-20). However, it is respectfully submitted that the licensing management facility of *Robert et al.* does NOT teach determining whether another copy of a first database is connected to a second database program. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that neither *Wobber et al.* nor *Robert et al.*

teach or suggest: providing network copy protection for database programs that operate on different computing platforms.

As noted in the specification, conventionally, a name binding protocol is used to implement network copy protection for database programs. One problem with using specific name binding protocol is that multiple copies of the same database programs cannot be detected when used in different platforms and for different connection protocols. Furthermore, the Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) does not have a suitable name binding protocol that is readily available to provide network copy protection for database programs (Specification, page 3). Accordingly, it is very respectfully submitted that providing a network copy protection solution that works for database programs across multiple platforms would NOT have been obvious even though communication between multiple platforms may have been possible.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of *Wobber et al.* and *Robert et al.* does NOT teach or suggest several other claimed features. These features include: sending an installation code identifier with session information and using it to determine whether it is in a list of connected guests (claim 20). It is earnestly believed that this feature has not been addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action.

As another example, claim 10 recites: sending the request as session information. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action, page 7, paragraph 16), *Robert et al.* does not teach this feature.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on

*Note: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP §713.01). This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFT 1.33(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative)
Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)